

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JAMES ROUMEL ALEXANDER,
JAIVON L. ALEXANDER and JAQUITA L.
ALEXANDER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GLORIA L. ALEXANDER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

RANDY SIMPSON, MARTY BULLOCK and
JOHNNY POWELL,

Respondents.

In the Matter of JARELL MELVIN ALEXANDER,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GLORIA LYNN ALEXANDER,

UNPUBLISHED

March 9, 1999

No. 205618

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 95-323217

UNPUBLISHED

No. 210995

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 95-323217

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MELVIN ADAMS,

Respondent.

Before: McDonald, P.J., and Hood and Doctoroff, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In Docket No. 205618, respondent appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to James Alexander, Jaivon Alexander and JaQuita Alexander pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). In Docket No. 210995, respondent appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to Jarell Alexander pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (i) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), (i) and (j). We affirm.

The court did not clearly err in either case in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Further, once a statutory ground for termination is shown to exist, termination of parental rights is mandatory unless the court finds that termination is “clearly not” in the child’s best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5). The burden is on the respondent to put forth evidence showing that termination is clearly not in the child’s best interests. *In re Hall-Smith, supra*. In this case, respondent failed to put forth evidence from which the court could conclude that termination of her parental rights was “clearly not” in the children’s best interests. Hence, the court did not err in terminating respondent’s parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Gary R. McDonald

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff